



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SOLA STATION APARTMENTS, SOLA
STATION LEASING OFFICE STAFF, and
JOHN DOE(S) AND JANE DOE(S), *in their
individual and official capacities*,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 3:25-1150-MGL

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,
SUMMARILY DISMISSING THIS CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE
AND WITHOUT FURTHER LEAVE FOR AMENDMENT,
AND DEEMING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS**

Plaintiff Jane Doe (Doe), who is representing herself, filed this action against Defendants Sola Station Apartments, Sola Station Leasing Office Staff, and John Doe(s) and Jane Doe(s), in their individual and official capacities. She alleges violations of the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601–3631, as well as state law claims for breach of contract, unjust enrichment, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court summarily dismiss this case without further leave for amendment. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on April 1, 2025. To date, Doe has failed to file any objections.

“[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standards set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this case is summarily **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and without further leave for amendment.

Because the Court is dismissing this action, Doe’s motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is necessarily **DEEMED AS MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 8th day of May 2025, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Doe is hereby notified of her right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.